

Remarks

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on October 21, 2009, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, claims 1, 12, and 16 have been amended for clarification. Support for the amended claims may be found on at least page 2, lines 28 through page 3, line 4 and on page 12, lines 18-28 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-16 and 18-21 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 5-6 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Babst, et al. (7,194,404, hereinafter "Babst") in view Robertson et al. (US 2006/0277213, hereinafter "Robertson") and in further view of Cotte (US 2004/0148351). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Babst in view of Robertson, Cotte, and in further in view of James et al. (US 2005/0198023, hereinafter "James"). Claims 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Babst in view of Robertson and in further view of Flaszka et al. (US 2003/0233340, hereinafter "Flaszka") and Cotte. Claims 16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flaszka in view of Robertson, Babst, and Cotte. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Babst in view of Robertson, Cotte, and Atkin et al. (US 2004/0181176, hereinafter "Atkin"). Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flaszka in view of Robertson, Babst, Cotte, and Atkin. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flaszka in view of Robertson, Babst, Cotte, and Atkin.

Applicants' Statement of the Substance of the Interview

A telephonic interview took place on November 10, 2009 between the Examiner and the undersigned representative for Applicants. Claim 1 was discussed, and in

particular, a discussion was held with respect to differences between proposed amendments to the aforementioned claim and the cited references of record. No agreement was reached in the interview. Applicants respectfully request entry of this statement of the substance of the interview.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-3 and 5-9

Claims 1-3 and 5-9 are rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Babst, Robertson, and Cotte. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 specifies a method of operating a jump bar of a contact manager, comprising the steps of: assigning a character code to a displayed button of the jump bar, the jump bar comprising a plurality of buttons, wherein the character code is uniquely associated with an alphanumeric character of a character set having a single character code uniquely associated with each alphanumeric character of a plurality of alphanumeric characters from a plurality of languages, wherein the jump bar comprises a button data table including a plurality of rows comprising at least a plurality of character codes for the plurality of alphanumeric characters, wherein each of the plurality of character codes represents an alphanumeric character associated with a different language. the plurality of rows equal to a maximum number of buttons displayable in the jump bar, wherein each button of the plurality of buttons of the jump bar is associated with two alphanumeric characters of a first language and simultaneously associated with two alphanumeric characters of at least a second language, wherein the first language is different from the second language, wherein each of the plurality of character codes represents an alphanumeric character associated with a different language, and wherein

the plurality of character codes are arranged as respectively contiguous ranges of numbers to enable the identification of a language to which an alphanumeric character belongs upon the identification of one of the plurality of character codes representing the alphanumeric character; retrieving contact information from a contacts information database by comparing the assigned character code and the first alphanumeric character of the last names of contacts having associated contact information previously stored in the contacts information database; and displaying the retrieved contact information in a window of the contact manager.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Babst, Robertson, and Cotte fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended claim 1. For example, the aforementioned combination fails to disclose “wherein each button of the plurality of buttons of the jump bar is associated with two alphanumeric characters of a first language and simultaneously associated with two alphanumeric characters of at least a second language, wherein the first language is different from the second language” and “wherein each of the plurality of character codes represents an alphanumeric character associated with a different language and wherein the plurality of character codes are arranged as respectively contiguous ranges of numbers to enable the identification of a language to which an alphanumeric character belongs upon the identification of one of the plurality of character codes representing the alphanumeric character.”

Babst discusses utilizing word chunks to enhance word prediction in response to receiving an input character. After a displayed word or word chunk is selected, selectable words including the selected word chunk are displayed. Using the word chunks, the number of keystrokes necessary to access a word is reduced. See Col. 3, lines 1-12.

Babst however, fails to disclose a jump bar comprising buttons where each button is associated with two alphanumeric characters of a first language and simultaneously associated with two alphanumeric characters of at least a second language, wherein the first language is different from the second language.

In contrast, Babst merely discusses a German language keyboard (see Fig. 1) showing 128 German language characters in eight (8) rows of the keyboard. Thus, Babst is silent with respect to a single jump bar button being associated with two alphanumeric characters of a first language and simultaneously associated with two alphanumeric characters of at least a second (different) language. In contrast, the “keys” of the German language keyboard in Fig. 1 of Babst are only associated with characters of a single language. Moreover, although Babst does discuss the use of various languages (e.g., romance and agglutinating languages – see Col. 12, lines 36-63), first and second alphanumeric characters of two different languages are not discussed as being simultaneously associated with each button of a jump bar.

Babst also fails to disclose a plurality of character codes representing an alphanumeric character associated with a different language or where the plurality of character codes are arranged as respectively contiguous ranges of numbers to enable the identification of a language to which an alphanumeric character belongs upon the identification of one of the plurality of character codes representing the alphanumeric character. In contrast, Babst is silent with respect to character codes being arranged as respectively contiguous ranges of numbers.

Robertson fails to cure the deficiencies of Babst. Robertson discusses a computer system for assisting users in locating and sharing information with other users by

providing a user interface which users can establish contact relationships with other users. Robertson further discusses functionality for users to search the contacts of contacts of the respective user and the search may be limited in scope. See paragraph 0012. Robertson however, is silent with respect to a single jump bar button being associated with two alphanumeric characters of a first language and simultaneously associated with two alphanumeric characters of at least a second (different) language or character codes being arranged as respectively contiguous ranges of numbers to enable the identification of a language to which an alphanumeric character belongs upon the identification of one of the plurality of character codes representing the alphanumeric character. In contrast, Robertson is merely concerned with locating and sharing contact information in a computer system. Thus, Robertson is silent regarding the aforementioned features specified in amended claim 1.

Cotte fails to cure the deficiencies of Babst and Robertson. Cotte discusses the exchange of communication preferences including languages, a protocol for defining automatic data exchange between telecommunications portals, the data including languages spoken, and a “jump” button by which persons can be selected according to the alphabet. See paragraphs 95, 131, and 223. Cotte however, is silent with respect to a single jump bar button being associated with two alphanumeric characters of a first language and simultaneously associated with two alphanumeric characters of at least a second (different) language or character codes being arranged as respectively contiguous ranges of numbers to enable the identification of a language to which an alphanumeric character belongs upon the identification of one of the plurality of character codes representing the alphanumeric character. In contrast, Cotte merely discusses that spoken

languages may be communicated as data between telecommunications portals. Cotte however, fails to disclose, for example, the simultaneous association of two alphanumeric characters on a jump button bar with two different languages in addition to failing to disclose the other aforementioned features specified in amended claim 1.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Babst, Robertson, and Cotte fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended claim 1. Therefore, amended claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 2-3, 5-6, and 8-9 depend from amended claim 1 and thus specify at least the same features. Therefore, these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons and the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Claim 4

Claim 4 is rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Babst, Robertson, Cotte, and James. The rejection of this claim is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 depends from independent claim 1 and thus specifies at least the same features. As discussed above, the combination of Babst and Robertson fails to teach, disclose, or suggest at least “wherein each button of the plurality of buttons of the jump bar is associated with two alphanumeric characters of a first language and simultaneously associated with two alphanumeric characters of at least a second language, wherein the first language is different from the second language” and “wherein each of the plurality of character codes represents an alphanumeric character associated with a different language and wherein the plurality of character codes are arranged as respectively contiguous ranges of numbers to enable the identification of a language to which an

alphanumeric character belongs upon the identification of one of the plurality of character codes representing the alphanumeric character.”

It is respectfully submitted that Jones fails to cure the deficiencies of Babst, Robertson, and Cotte. James discusses the selection and ordering of one or more sets of linguistic objects for text disambiguation. James further discusses the ordering of a first list of items in a first language and a second list of items in a second language and where the two lists of items are displayed in an order based on the first language having a priority over the second language or vice versa. See paragraph 0009. Thus, James is merely concerned with the ordering of linguistic objects for disambiguating different languages. James however, is silent regarding a single jump bar button being associated with two alphanumeric characters of a first language and simultaneously associated with two alphanumeric characters of at least a second (different) language. James, as discussed above, discusses the ordering and display of items in an order based on language priority. Thus, there is no teaching of the simultaneous association of alphanumeric characters representing two different languages. James is also silent with respect to character codes being arranged as respectively contiguous ranges of numbers to enable the identification of a language to which an alphanumeric character belongs upon the identification of one of the plurality of character codes representing the alphanumeric character.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Babst, Robertson, Cotte, and James fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claim 4. Therefore, claim 4 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Claims 10-15

Claims 10-15 are rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Babst, Robertson, Flaszka, and Cotte. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claims 10 specifies similar features as independent claim 1, discussed above, and thus is allowable over the combination of Babst, Robertson, and Cotte for at least the same reasons. Flaszka fails to cure the deficiencies of Babst, Robertson, and Cotte. Flaszka discusses the ordering of character strings by determining which of two character strings has a lower collating weight according to a first dictionary sort order table with a non-unique collating sequence, and determining which of the two character strings has a lower collating weight according to a second dictionary sort order table with a unique collating sequence. See paragraph 0010. Flaszka also discusses multiple code points associated with a single alphabetic character. See Figures 1-3 (showing two code points each for the upper and lower case characters A-J).

As discussed above, Flaszka is merely concerned with the ordering of character strings using unique and non-unique collating sequences based on collating weights (e.g., upper and lower case characters may have different weights – see Flaszka, paragraph 0023). Therefore, Flaszka is silent regarding a single jump bar button being associated with two alphanumeric characters of a first language and simultaneously associated with two alphanumeric characters of at least a second (different) language. In contrast, Flaszka discusses multiple code points (i.e., upper and lower case alphabetic characters such as the English language characters A-J) associated with a single alphabetic character. However, this is different than a jump bar button being simultaneously associated two alphanumeric characters of different languages, as specified in amended claim 10. Flaszka is also silent with respect to character codes being arranged as respectively contiguous

ranges of numbers to enable the identification of a language to which an alphanumeric character belongs upon the identification of one of the plurality of character codes representing the alphanumeric character. In contrast, Flasz (see paragraph 20) merely discusses an ASCII character set which includes characters for Roman letters that are generally used for the English and other languages and which are presented in a standardized dictionary sort order. Thus, Flasz fails to disclose character codes arranged as respectively contiguous ranges of numbers to enable the identification of a language to which an alphanumeric character belongs. In particular, Flasz fails to disclose how the character set discussed therein enables the identification of a language to which an alphanumeric character belongs upon the identification of a character code representing the alphanumeric character.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Babst, Robertson, Flasz, and Cotte fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended claim 10. Therefore, amended claim 10 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 11-15 depend from amended claim 10 and thus specify at least the same features. Therefore, these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons and the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Claims 16 and 18-20

Claims 16 and 18-20 are rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Flasz in view of Robertson, Babst, and Cotte. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 16 specifies similar features as independent claims 10, discussed above, and thus is allowable over the combination of Flasz, Robertson,

Babst, and Cotte for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 18-20 depend from amended claim 16 and thus specify at least the same features. Therefore, these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons and the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Claim 7

Claim 7 is rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Babst, Robertson, Cotte, and Atkin. The rejection of this claim is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 depends from independent claim 1 and thus specifies at least the same features. As discussed above with respect to amended claim 1, the combination of Babst, Robertson, and Cotte fails to teach, disclose, or suggest at least “wherein each button of the plurality of buttons of the jump bar is associated with two alphanumeric characters of a first language and simultaneously associated with two alphanumeric characters of at least a second language, wherein the first language is different from the second language” and “wherein each of the plurality of character codes represents an alphanumeric character associated with a different language and wherein the plurality of character codes are arranged as respectively contiguous ranges of numbers to enable the identification of a language to which an alphanumeric character belongs upon the identification of one of the plurality of character codes representing the alphanumeric character.”

It is respectfully submitted that Atkin fails to cure the deficiencies of Babst, Robertson, and Cotte. Atkin discusses providing Unicode support in legacy operating systems. A focus hook module, keyboard hook module, and keystroke conversion

module are registered with the legacy operating system. The focus book module determines whether the currently active application is Unicode capable. The keystroke conversion module converts the keyboard events into Unicode characters which are sent back to the keyboard hook module. See paragraphs 0008 and 0009. As discussed above, Atkin is merely concerned with Unicode support in legacy operating systems. Therefore, Atkins is silent with respect to a single jump bar button being associated with two alphanumeric characters of a first language and simultaneously associated with two alphanumeric characters of at least a second (different) language or character codes being arranged as respectively contiguous ranges of numbers to enable the identification of a language to which an alphanumeric character belongs upon the identification of one of the plurality of character codes representing the alphanumeric character.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Babst, Robertson, Cotte, and Atkins fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claim 7. Therefore, claim 7 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Claim 15

Claim 15 is rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Flasz, Robertson, Babst, Cotte, and Atkin. The rejection of this claim is respectfully traversed.

Claim 15 depends from independent claim 10 and thus specifies at least the same features. As discussed above, neither Flasz, Robertson, Babst, Cotte, nor Atkin teaches, discloses, or suggests at least “wherein each button of the plurality of buttons of the jump bar is associated with two alphanumeric characters of a first language and simultaneously associated with two alphanumeric characters of at least a second language, wherein the first language is different from the second language” and “wherein each of the plurality

of character codes represents an alphanumeric character associated with a different language and wherein the plurality of character codes are arranged as respectively contiguous ranges of numbers to enable the identification of a language to which an alphanumeric character belongs upon the identification of one of the plurality of character codes representing the alphanumeric character.” Therefore, the aforementioned combination fails to teach, disclose, or suggest the aforementioned features. Accordingly, claim 15 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Claim 21

Claim 21 is rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Flaszka, Robertson, Babst, Cotte and Atkin. The rejection of this claim is respectfully traversed.

Claim 21 depends from amended claim 16 and thus specifies at least the same features. As discussed above, neither Flaszka, Robertson, Babst, Cotte, nor Atkin teaches, discloses, or suggests at least “wherein each button of the plurality of buttons of the jump bar is associated with two alphanumeric characters of a first language and simultaneously associated with two alphanumeric characters of at least a second language, wherein the first language is different from the second language” and “wherein each of the plurality of character codes represents an alphanumeric character associated with a different language and wherein the plurality of character codes are arranged as respectively contiguous ranges of numbers to enable the identification of a language to which an alphanumeric character belongs upon the identification of one of the plurality of character codes representing the alphanumeric character.” Therefore, the aforementioned combination fails to teach, disclose, or suggest the aforementioned features. Accordingly, claim 21 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants attorney at the number listed below.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

Date: **November 11, 2009**

/Alton Hornsby III/

Alton Hornsby III

Reg. No. 47,299

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903

(404) 954-5064

27488

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE